



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/601,805

06/23/2003

Dirk Trossen

042933/263001

8172

826

7590

06/19/2008

ALSTON & BIRD LLP

BANK OF AMERICA PLAZA

101 SOUTH TRYON STREET, SUITE 4000

CHARLOTTE, NC 28280-4000

EXAMINER

BAYARD, DJENANE M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2141

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/19/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/601,805

Applicant(s)

TROSSEN, DIRK

Examiner

DJENANE M. BAYARD

Art Unit

2141

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 February 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SE/US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This is in response to amendment filed on 2/21/08 in which claims 1-20 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-2, 6, 8-9, 13 and 15-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application NO. 2006/0200444 to Bracho et al.

- a. As per claims 1, Bracho et al teaches a method for restricting event subscriptions, wherein each event subscription subscribes to an event maintained by an event server, the method comprising: receiving, at a proxy associated with the event server (*information broker*) from a network entity (*client*) , a subscription message subscribing to the event (See page 6, paragraph [0065] and page 8, paragraph [0083]); determining whether the network entity is an authorized subscriber (See page 8, paragraph [0081-0085], *the client has a digital certificate that*

is presented to the broker, it is then determined if the identity named in the digital certificate is a member of the client group); and forwarding the subscription message to the event server if the network entity is an authorized subscriber (See page 8, paragraph [0084-0085]), the network entity thereafter being capable of receiving communication from the event server in accordance with the subscription without again determining whether the network entity is an authorized subscriber (See page 6, paragraph [0061], the client can enter a multi-session subscription with the information broker).

b. As per claim 8, Bracho et al teaches a system for restricting event subscriptions, the system comprising: an event server capable of maintaining at least one event (See page 5, paragraph [0058], *event producing resources*); a network entity capable of sending a subscription message subscribing to the event (See page 6, paragraph [0061], *a broker client must have entered a corresponding subscription with an information broker*); a proxy associated with the event server, and coupled between the event server and the network entity (See page 6, paragraph [0061], *information broker*), wherein the proxy is capable of receiving the subscription message (See page 6, paragraph [0061-0065]); and a filter configured to receive the subscription message from the proxy (See page 7, paragraph [0068] and page 9, paragraph [0088]), and thereafter determine whether the network entity is an authorized subscriber (See page 8, paragraph [0084-0085]) wherein the proxy is capable of forwarding the subscription message to the event server if the network entity is an authorized subscriber (See page 6, paragraph [0065] and page 8, paragraph [0084-0085]), the network entity thereafter being capable of receiving communication from the event server in accordance with the subscription

without the filter again determining whether the network entity is an authorized subscriber(See page 6, paragraph [0061], the client can enter a multi-session subscription with the information broker).

c. As per claim 15, Bracho et al teaches a filter for restricting event subscriptions, wherein each event subscription subscribes to an event maintained by an event server, the filter comprising: a database capable of storing a list of authorized subscribers (See page 8, paragraph [0084]); a processor capable of receiving, from a proxy associated with the event server, a subscription message from a network entity subscribing to the event, wherein the processor is capable of determining whether the network entity is an authorized subscriber based upon the list of authorized subscribers (See page 6, paragraph [0065] and page 8, paragraph [0084-0085])., and wherein the processor is capable of indicating to the proxy whether the network entity is an authorized subscriber such that the proxy can forward the subscription message to the event server if the network entity is an authorized subscriber (See page 6, paragraph [0065] and page 8, paragraph [0084-0085]), the network entity thereafter being capable of receiving communication from the event server in accordance with the subscription without the processor again determining whether the network entity is an authorized subscriber(See page 6, paragraph [0061], the client can enter a multi-session subscription with the information broker).

d. As per claims 2, 9 and 16, Bracho et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. Furthermore, Bracho et al teaches wherein determining whether the network entity is an

authorized subscriber comprises checking for a match of the network entity in a list of authorized subscribers, and wherein forwarding the subscription message comprises forwarding the subscription message if a match is located (See page 8, paragraph [0084-0085]).

e. As per claims 6 and 13, Bracho et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. Furthermore, Bracho et al teaches confirming reception of the subscription message, from the event server to the network entity, if a match is located and the subscription message is forwarded to the event server (See page 8, paragraph [0084-0085]).

f. As per claim 20, Bracho et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. Furthermore, Bracho et al teaches wherein determining whether the network entity is an authorized subscriber comprises determining, in response to receiving the subscription message, whether the network entity is an authorized subscriber for the respective event of the event server (See page 6, paragraph [0065] and 8, paragraph [0084-0085]).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 3-5, 10-12 and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application No. 2006/0200444 to Bracho et al in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0099829 to Richards et al.

a. As per claims 3, 10 and 17, Bracho et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Bracho et fails to teach teaches wherein checking for a match comprises checking for a match of a uniform resource identifier (URI) associated with the network entity with at least a partial URI in the list of authorized subscribers.

Richards et al teaches wherein checking for a match comprises checking for a match of a uniform resource identifier (URI) associated with the network entity with at least a partial URI in the list of authorized subscribers (See page 10, paragraph [0140], page 13, paragraph [0175]).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Richards et al in the claimed invention of Bracho et al in order to for the filter proxy to operate in such a manner as to handle many requests from same and of different types of rendering devices simultaneously (See page 4, paragraph [0028]).

b. As per claims 4, 11 and 18, Bracho et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. Furthermore, Bracho et al teaches wherein the subscription message includes at least one of an event package description and an event type description, and wherein checking for a match further comprises checking for a match of at least one of the at least one of the event package description and the event type description in the subscription message with at least one of an event package description (See page 6, paragraph [0062-0065] and page 8, paragraph [0084-

0085]. However, Bracho et al fails to teaches wherein an event type description associated with the at least a partial URI in the list of authorized subscribers.

Richards et al teaches wherein an event type description associated with the at least a partial URI in the list of authorized subscribers (See page 9, paragraph [0131-0132]).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Richards et al in the claimed invention of Bracho et al in order to for the filter proxy to operate in such a manner as to handle many requests from same and of different types of rendering devices simultaneously (See page 4, paragraph [0028]).

c. As per claims 5, 12 and 19, Bracho et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. Furthermore, Bracho et al teaches sending a list of authorized subscribers to the proxy before receiving the subscription message (See page 8, paragraph [0084]) wherein the list of authorized subscribers identifies the event server and at least one authorized subscriber (See page 8 paragraph [0084]). However, Bracho et al fails to teach wherein at least one authorized subscriber is identified by at least one of a uniform resource identifier (URI) associated with the at least one authorized subscriber, an event package description associated with a subscription message, and an event type description associated with a subscription message.

Richards et al teaches wherein at least one authorized subscriber is identified by at least one of a uniform resource identifier (URI) associated with the at least one authorized subscriber (See page 12, paragraph [0164]), an event package description associated with a subscription message, and an event type description associated with a subscription message (See page 9, paragraph [0131-0134]).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Richards et al in the claimed invention of Bracho et al in order to for the filter proxy to operate in such a manner as to handle many requests from same and of different types of rendering devices simultaneously (See page 4, paragraph [0028]).

7. Claims 7 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application No. 2006/0200444 to Bracho et al in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0133641 to McKinnon et al.

a. As per claims 7 and 14, Richards et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Martin fails to teach receiving a subscription message comprises receiving, at a session initiation protocol (SIP) proxy, a subscription message comprising a SIP SUBSCRIBE message, and wherein forwarding the subscription message comprises forwarding the SIP SUBSCRIBE message to the event server comprising a SIP event server.

McKinnon et al teaches receiving a subscription message comprises receiving, at a session initiation protocol (SIP) proxy, a subscription message comprising a SIP SUBSCRIBE message, and wherein forwarding the subscription message comprises forwarding the SIP SUBSCRIBE message to the event server comprising a SIP event server (See page 3, paragraph [0027], [0031])

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of McKinnon et al in the claimed invention of Richards et

al in order to facilitate media sessions and update participating devices of state changes (See page 1, paragraph [0004]).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Djenane M. Bayard whose telephone number is (571) 272-3878. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Friday 5:30 AM- 3:00 PM..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharja can be reached on (571) 272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Djenane Bayard

Patent Examiner
/William C. Vaughn, Jr./

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2144